



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/694,396 | 10/28/2003 | Nobuhiko Ozaki | 61352-054 | 9206 |

20277 7590 12/12/2006

MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
600 13TH STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER

BOWERS, NATHAN ANDREW

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1744

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/694,396 | Applicant(s) OZAKI ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Nathan A. Bowers | Art Unit 1744 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 June 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>062304</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "the electric double layer of the interface" in line 2 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

- 1) Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hollis (US 5846708) in view of Vogel (US 6758961).

With respect to claims 1-3, Hollis discloses an integrated electrode comprising a substrate (Figure 15:212) equipped with at least one electrode conductor (Figure 15:220) and a wiring part that leads an electrical signal out from the electric conductor. A dielectric material (Figure 15:216) is coated over at least a part of the surface of the electric conductor. The integrated electrode can detect an electrical signal resulting from an electrophysiological change of a cell immobilized on the surface of the electric conductor, and the cell is an isolated cell or a cultured cell. This is described in Figure 15 and in column 8, line 59 to column 9, line 31. Hollis discloses an additional embodiment set forth in column 7, line 60 to column 8, line 28 and Figure 14 in which a silicon nitride dielectric layer (Figure 14:21C) and a dielectric gap (Figure 14:60) are positioned over a metal electrode (Figure 14:20C). This embodiment is also capable of

Art Unit: 1744

detecting electrical signals resulting from electrophysiological changes of cells immobilized on the surface of the electric conductor. Hollis, however, does not expressly disclose in either embodiment that the dielectric material is a positively charged polymer.

Vogel discloses a device for measuring electrical properties of cells. The device includes a substrate (Figure 1:5) comprising an aperture (Figure 1:3) at which a biological analyte, such as a cell, is placed. Electrodes are positioned above and below the aperture in order to determine how the presence of the cell at the aperture affects the voltage difference across the substrate. This is described in column 6, line 53 to column 7, line 26. Column 3, lines 17-20 and column 3, line 63 to column 4, line 27 state that the aperture is provided with a positively charged material that facilitates the attachment of the cell membrane. Vogel specifically discloses the use of polylysine and polyethyleneimine materials.

Hollis and Vogel are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor regarding microfluidic devices that are used to electrically monitor cells.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to utilize polylysine and polyethyleneimine materials in the construction of the dielectric layer disclosed by Hollis. This is due to the fact that Vogel teaches that polylysine and polyethyleneimine provide good electrical attraction to cells, and thereby effectively aid in the detection of biological analytes. This would allow cells to move to the detection region of Hollis's device based on electrostatic interactions that would not damage the cell membrane.

Art Unit: 1744

By promoting electrically tight binding, polylysine and polyethyleneimine materials would allow for detection to be conducted with greater sensitivity.

With respect to claim 5, Hollis and Vogel disclose the apparatus set forth in claim 1 as set forth in the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection above. In addition, Hollis indicates in column 9, lines 18-20 that the electrodes are made from tungsten. Column 11, lines 25-41 further disclose the use of platinum, gold and tungsten electrodes.

With respect to claims 6 and 7, Hollis and Vogel disclose the apparatus set forth in claim 1 as set forth in the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection above. Hollis additionally states that at least part of the electrode conductor coated with dielectric material is further coated with a cell adhesive protein immobilization material (Figure 14:22C). This is described in column 1, lines 18-29, column 10, lines 59-67 and column 18, lines 47-49.

With respect to claim 8, Hollis and Vogel disclose the apparatus set forth in claim 1 as set forth in the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection above. Although Hollis does not expressly disclose specific capacitances, it is believed that Hollis's apparatus is fully capable of demonstrating a capacitance of $27 \mu\text{F}/\text{cm}^2$ or greater at the applied voltage of 0 V. This is due to the fact that Hollis discloses identical electrode materials (platinum, gold and tungsten) as Applicant. In any event, it is believed that the creation of a specific desired capacitance of result effective variable that can be optimized through routine experimentation. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to ensure that a

Art Unit: 1744

capacitance of $27 \mu\text{F}/\text{cm}^2$ or greater is achieved if it was determined that this provided the results during experimentation. See MPEP-2144.05.

With respect to claims 12-14, Hollis and Vogel disclose the apparatus set forth in claim 1 as set forth in the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection above. Hollis further teaches that the overall system includes a plurality of solution retaining parts (Figure 4:18, Figure 14:18C, Figure 15:224) that each include at least one surface of one of the electric conductors. Each solution retaining part disclosed in Figures 14 and 15 includes one electrical conductor. Each solution retaining part disclosed in Figure 4 includes multiple electrical conductors.

2) Claims 1-3 and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoeniger (US 20030211637) in view of Vogel (US 6758961).

With respect to claims 1-3, Schoeniger discloses an integrated electrode comprising a substrate (Figure 1:11) equipped with at least one electric conductor (Figure 1:13) and a wiring part which leads an electrical signal out from the electric conductor. This is disclosed in paragraphs [0033] and [0039]-[0041]. The integrated electrode can detect an electrical signal resulting from an electrophysiological change of an isolated cell (Figure 1:19) immobilized on the surface of the electric conductor. At least part of the surface of the electric conductor is coated with a silicon nitride dielectric material (Figure 1:14). Schoeniger, however, does not expressly disclose that the dielectric material is a positively charged polymer.

Vogel discloses a device for measuring electrical properties of cells. The device includes a substrate (Figure 1:5) comprising an aperture (Figure 1:3) at which a biological analyte, such as a cell, is placed. Electrodes are positioned above and below the aperture in order to determine how the presence of the cell at the aperture affects the voltage difference across the substrate. This is described in column 6, line 53 to column 7, line 26. Column 3, lines 17-20 and column 3, line 63 to column 4, line 27 state that the aperture is provided with a positively charged material that facilitates the attachment of the cell membrane. Vogel specifically discloses the use of polylysine and polyethyleneimine materials.

Schoeniger and Vogel are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor regarding microfluidic devices that are used to electrically monitor cells.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to utilize polylysine and polyethyleneimine materials in the construction of the dielectric layer disclosed by Schoeniger. This is due to the fact that Vogel teaches that polylysine and polyethyleneimine provide good electrical attraction to cells, and thereby effectively aid in the detection of biological analytes. This would allow cells to move to the detection region of Schoeniger's device based on electrostatic interactions that would not damage the cell membrane. By promoting electrically tight binding, polylysine and polyethyleneimine materials would allow for detection to be conducted with greater sensitivity.

With respect to claim 5, Schoeniger and Vogel disclose the apparatus set forth in claim 1 as set forth in the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection above. In addition, Schoeniger teaches in paragraph [0039] that the electrode is made from platinum.

With respect to claims 6 and 7, Schoeniger and Vogel disclose the apparatus set forth in claim 1 as set forth in the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection above. Schoeniger additionally states that the surface of the electric conductor coated with dielectric material is further coated with an immobilization material (Figure 1:17). The use of cell adhesive antibodies and peptides is expressed in paragraphs [0019] and [0032].

With respect to claim 8, Schoeniger and Vogel disclose the apparatus set forth in claim 1 as set forth in the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection above. Although Schoeniger does not expressly disclose specific capacitances, it is believed that Schoeniger's apparatus is fully capable of demonstrating a capacitance of $27 \mu\text{F}/\text{cm}^2$ or greater at the applied voltage of 0 V. This is due to the fact that Schoeniger discloses identical electrode materials (platinum) as Applicant. In any event, it is believed that the creation of a specific desired capacitance of result effective variable that can be optimized through routine experimentation. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to ensure that a capacitance of $27 \mu\text{F}/\text{cm}^2$ or greater is achieved if it was determined that this provided the results during experimentation. See MPEP 2144.05.

Art Unit: 1744

3) Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Hollis (US 5846708) or Schoeniger (US 20030211637) in view of Vogel (US 6758961) each as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Nisch (US 6315940).

The combination of Hollis and Vogel and the combination of Schoeniger and Vogel each disclose the apparatus set forth in claim 1 as set forth in the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections above. The references, however, do not expressly disclose that the electric conductor is formed within at least one through-hole formed to the substrate.

Nisch discloses a microelectrode device for the investigation of biological cells. Nisch discloses a substrate (Figure 1:16) equipped with at least one electric conductor (Figure 1:21) capable of detecting an electrical signal resulting from an electrophysiological change of a cell immobilized on its surface. The substrate includes a plurality of detection regions, as indicated in Figure 4, each comprising a through-hole (Figure 1:22) formed in the substrate.

Hollis, Schoeniger, Vogel and Nisch are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor regarding microfluidic devices that are used to electrically monitor cells.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to provide the electrical conductors disclosed by Hollis and Schoeniger at a plurality of through-holes. In column 3, lines 16-18, column 4, lines 1-24 and column 7, lines 16-28, Nisch teaches that this configuration is beneficial because it allows one to move cells to the electrode in a controlled manner using a mechanical means such as a vacuum. In this way, one is able to guarantee that the cells are correctly positioned during electrical testing.

Art Unit: 1744

4) Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Schoeniger (US 20030211637) in view of Vogel (US 6758961) as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Wolf (US 6376233).

Schoeniger and Vogel disclose the apparatus set forth in claim 1 as set forth in the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection above, however do not disclose that the integrated electrode is part of a system that includes a solution retaining part.

Wolf discloses an apparatus and method for recording electrophysiological activity of biological cells. A plurality of sensors (Figure 4:7) are provided to correspond with the wells (Figure 3:10) formed by a microtiter plate (Figure 3:11). This is described in column 6, lines 17-30 and in Figures 3-6. Each sensor array (Figure 4:7a) includes at least one stimulus electrode capable of interacting with cells. Wolf additionally discloses a retaining part (Figure 3) capable of culturing cells in a region directly above the sensor array.

Schoeniger, Vogel and Wolf are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor regarding microfluidic devices that are used to electrically monitor cells.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to provide the device proposed by Schoeniger and Vogel with a solution retaining part capable of culturing cells. This would have been beneficial because it would have allowed one to encourage cell growth at the integrated electrode, thus removing the need to transport the cell sample from a remote location to the sensor. By eliminating this transportation step, one would be able to increase efficiency and reduce contamination and fluid loss.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 4 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

It is believed that the prior art does not disclose the use of a polymer material having a biguanide group or a carbamoylguanide group to facilitate cell immobilization. In fact, the majority of the prior art seems to teach away from using biguanide and/or carbamoylguanide polymers in this way, especially since biguanide and/or carbamoylguanide polymers are known to be biocidal agents. This is best seen in the Sawan (US 20030147925) reference.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan A. Bowers whose telephone number is (571) 272-8613. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gladys Corcoran can be reached on (571) 272-1214. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1744

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197. (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



NAB



GLADYS JP CORCORAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER